M.F

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,551	12/20/2003	Stefan Gudmundsson	7589.143.PCUS00	1550

28694 7590 02/23/2007

NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP
1300 EYE STREET NW
SUITE 1000 WEST TOWER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, DAVID Q	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/707,551	GUDMUNDSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Q. Nguyen	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 13 can not depend itself. Appropriate correction is required. For purpose of examining, Examiner assumes that claim 13 depends on claim 12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-18,20-21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marlowe (WO 98/10602) in view of Antonucci et al. (US 6,819,929 B2) and further in view of Nojima (US 5,933,080).

Regarding claim 1, Marlowe discloses a system for providing a communication link between a central station (see fig. 1; central site system 300) and a remote mobile or stationary object (see fig. 1, remote unit 100) by means of transmitting and receiving communication means (see fig. 1; telecommunication system 200) for speech and data transmission (see page 7, line 23 to page 10, line 4; page 10, line 2), the communication link comprises both a speech transmission

link between the central station and the operator of the remote object (see fig. 1 and page 7, line 23 to page 10, line 4; page 10, line 2), a data transmission link between the remote object and the central station, wherein the system comprises a centralized communication and a database server, the data transmission link being routed via a centralized communication and database server (see fig. 1, database server 300C) for handling at least one of operator and object related information by the selected central station (see fig. 1 and page 7, line 23 to page 10, line 4; page 10, line 2). Marlowe does not mention the central station is selected out of a number of individual, different central stations. However, Antonucci et al. discloses a central station is selected out of a number of individual, different central stations (see fig. 6, col. 17, lines 1-13 and col. 19, lines 8-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Antonucci et al to the system of Marlowe in order to provide information requested by mobile user accurately and quickly.

The system of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al. does not mention wherein the information includes an emergency having a priority used to determine preferred handling thereof. However, Nojima discloses information including an emergency having a priority used to determine preferred handling thereof (see col. 7, lines 33-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Nojima to the system of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al. so that it would be desirable to quickly and accurately make an emergency call to concerned agencies or sources of help.

Regarding claim 2, Marlowe also discloses wherein the communication and database server comprises a communication server with functionality for handling operator and object

identification (see fig. 1 and page 23, line 1 to page 24, line 17), an operator and object information database as well an application server with functionality for making relevant information available to the central station (see fig. 1 and page 23, line 1 to page 24, line 17).

Regarding claim 3, Marlowe also discloses wherein the application server is provided with functionality for updating operator and object information (see fig. 1 and page 23, line 1 to page 24, line 17).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Marlowe also discloses wherein the communication links are established via a cellular communication network or a satellite communication network (see fig. 1); wherein the central station is a customer service center and the remote object is remote object is one of a vehicle, a boat, a plane and a remote facility (see fig. 1).

Regarding claim 6, Marlowe also discloses wherein the central station is a customer service center and the remote object is remote object is one of a vehicle, a boat, and a plane equipped with a Global Positioning System for providing information regarding the remote object's position (see fig. 1 and page 23, line 2 to 13).

Regarding claim 7, Marlowe discloses a method for providing a communication link between a central station and a remote mobile or stationary object (see fig. 1 and explanation in claim 1), characterized in the steps of establishing a speech connection between the central station and the remote object (see page 7, line 23 to page 10, line 4; page 10, line 2), and simultaneously establishing data connections between the remote object and a communication and database server for handling at least one of operator and object related information by the central station as well as between the central station and said communication and database server (see page 7, line 23 to page 10, line 4; page 10, line 2). Marlowe does not mention the central

station is selected out of a number of individual, different central stations. However, Antonucci et al. discloses a central station is selected out of a number of individual, different central stations (see fig. 6, col. 17, lines 1-13 and col. 19, lines 8-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Antonucci et al to the system of Marlowe in order to provide information requested by mobile user accurately and quickly.

The method of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al. does not mention wherein the information includes an emergency having a priority used to determine preferred handling thereof. However, Nojima discloses information including an emergency having a priority used to determine preferred handling thereof (see col. 7, lines 33-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Nojima to the system of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al. so that it would be desirable to quickly and accurately make an emergency call to concerned agencies or sources of help.

Regarding claim 8, Marlowe also discloses the steps of locating the position of the remote object (see page 20, lines 23-27), controlling the functional and operational status of the remote object and its operator, and adapting the response to the type of service requested (see page 21, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 9, Marlowe also discloses the steps of providing the communication and database server with the functionality for adding, removing and updating services (see page 33, line 17 to page 34, line 5).

Regarding claim 10, Marlowe discloses a method for activating a service center response to a vehicle service request call, said method comprising: providing a system for establishing a communication link between a central station and a remote mobile or stationary object (see explanation in claims 1 and 7); and transmitting and receiving speech and data communications transmission via the communication link that comprises both a speech transmission link between the central station and the operator of the remote object, as well as a data transmission link between the remote object and the central station which is routed via a centralized communication and database server for handling at least one of operator and object related information by the central station (see explanation in claims 1 and 7). Marlowe does not mention the central station is selected out of a number of individual, different central stations. However, Antonucci et al. discloses a central station is selected out of a number of individual, different central stations (see fig. 6, col. 17, lines 1-13 and col. 19, lines 8-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Antonucci et al to the system of Marlowe in order to provide information requested by mobile user accurately and quickly.

The method of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al. does not mention wherein the information includes an emergency having a priority used to determine preferred handling thereof. However, Nojima discloses information including an emergency having a priority used to determine preferred handling thereof (see col. 7, lines 33-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Nojima to the system of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al. so that it would

be desirable to quickly and accurately make an emergency call to concerned agencies or sources of help.

Regarding claim 11, Marlowe also discloses wherein the communication and database server comprises a communication server with functionality for handling operator and object identification (see explanation in claim 2), an operator and object information database as well an application server with functionality for making relevant information available to the central station (see explanation in claim 2).

Regarding claim 12, Marlowe also discloses wherein the application server is provided with functionality for updating operator and object information (see explanation in claim 3).

Regarding claim 13, Marlowe also discloses wherein the communication links are established via a cellular communication network or a satellite communication network (see explanation in claim 4).

Regarding claim 14, Marlowe also discloses wherein the central station is a customer service center and the remote object is one of a vehicle, a boat, a plane and a remote facility (see explanation in claim 5).

Regarding claim 15, Marlowe also discloses wherein the central station is a customer service center and the remote object is one of a land vehicle, a boat, and a plane equipped with a Global Positioning System for providing location information about the remote object (see explanation in claim 6).

Regarding claims 16-17,20 and 23, the system of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al. also discloses wherein the different central stations have different interfaces (see fig. 6 of Antonucci et al.), and the centralized communication and database server is adapted to handle at

least one of operator and object related information in view of the interface of the selected central station (see fig. 6 and its description of Antonucci et al.); wherein each central station is a national service center operator (see fig. 6 and its description of Antonucci et al.).

Regarding claims 18,21, and 24, the system of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al does not mention wherein the speech transmission link is separate from data transmission link. However, the speech transmission link being separate from data transmission link is well known in the art as disclosed by Jayapalan (see abstract of US 5533019). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching in order to avoid congestion of voice link.

4. Claims 19,22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marlowe (WO 98/10602) in view of Antonucci et al. (US 6,819,929 B2) further in view of Nojima (US 5,933,080) and still further in view of Lichter et al. (US 6,256,489 B1).

Regarding claims 19,22, and 25, the system and method of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al and further in view of Nojima does not mention wherein the speech transmission link is provided directly between the selected central station and the operator of the remote object. However, Lichter et al. discloses the speech transmission link is provided directly between the selected central station and the operator of the remote object. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Lichter et al. to the system so that users can report to PSAP clearly and quickly.

5. Claims 26-27,29-30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marlowe (WO 98/10602) in view of Antonucci et al. (US 6,819,929 B2) and further in view of Nojima (US 5,933,080) and still further in view of Hattori et al. (US 6,285,931).

Regarding claims 26-27,29-30, and 32-33, the system of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al. and further in view of Nojima does not include remote diagnosis of the emergency; and generation of diagnostic report. However, Hattori et al disclose remote diagnosis of the emergency; and generation of diagnostic report (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Hattori et al. to the system in order to assist drivers in evaluating their vehicles' operation.

6. Claims 28,31, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marlowe (WO 98/10602) in view of Antonucci et al. (US 6,819,929 B2) and further in view of Nojima (US 5,933,080) and still further in view of Ross (US 5673305).

Regarding claims 28,31 and 34, the system of Marlowe in view of Antonucci et al. and further in view of Nojima does not mention wherein a module provides the information using an emergency sensor. However, Ross discloses a module provides the information using an emergency sensor (see col. 5, line 60 to col. 7, line 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Hattori et al. to the system so that the central station knows the vehicle's location and the particular motor vehicle has crashed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7844. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOSEPH H. FEILD can be reached on (571)272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David Q Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2617

JEAN GELIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

***